

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0135.C1

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated April 13, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 13, 2005. Claims 1-10 and 21-30 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-10, 21, 22, 25, 27, 29 and 30 stand rejected, and claims 23, 24, 26 and 30 are indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9 and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,655,459. In response, Applicant submits that the terminal disclaimer filed herewith overcomes the rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 21, 22, 25, 27, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Bissonnette* (U.S. Patent No. 4,669,541). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Further, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

As discussed with the Examiner in an interview with Bruce Patterson and Chance Hardie on June 6, 2005, *Bissonnette* fails to teach a tubular housing disposed at an end of a tubular string and forming part of the tubular string, the tubular housing having an enlarged inner diameter section at an end thereof proximate the end of the tubular string

Page 5

361685_1.DOC

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0135.C1

terminating into the wellbore, as recited in claim 21. This failure of *Bissonnette* to teach each and every limitation precludes *Bissonnette* from anticipating claim 21 and claims 22, 25, 27, 29 and 30 dependent thereon. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 23, 24, 26 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response, Applicant has rewritten claim 24 in independent form including the limitations of its base claim. Regarding claims 23, 26, and 28, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable based at least on the traversal presented above regarding claim 21 from which these claims depend. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection and allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant

Page 6

361685_1.DOC